REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-85 were presented for examination and are pending in this application. In an Official Office Action dated December 14, 2005, claims 1-85 were rejected. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his consideration and addresses the Examiner's comments concerning the claims pending in this application below.

Applicant herein amends claims 5, 6, 29, 30, 56, 61, 62, and 69 and respectfully traverses the Examiner's prior rejections. Claim 60 is canceled without prejudice and no new claims are presently added. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution and issuance of the application. In making this amendment, Applicant has not and is not narrowing the scope of the protection to which the Applicant considers the claimed invention to be entitled and does not concede, directly or by implication, that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicant reserves the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

I. Double Patenting.

Claims 1-41 and 48-62 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of Double Patenting over claims 1-37 of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/932,330.

Although the claims as presented are believed to be distinct with respect to U.S. Patent Application No. 09/932,330, a terminal disclaimer will be supplied together with the required fee upon indication of allowable subject matter in the

present case and U.S. Patent Application No. 09/932,330. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the double patenting rejection be held in abeyance.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection of claims

Claim 5, 6, 29, 30, 62, and 69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the aforementioned claims contain the trademark/trade name RIMM or Rambus™ In-Line Memory Module. The claims have been amended to remove the trademark Rambus™ leaving the limitations generic as to In-Line Memory Modules. The Applicant requests the rejection be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-4, 9, 19-21, 25-28, 33, 49-51, 55-61, 63-68, 70-77, and 83-85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,052,134 ("Foster") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,972,457 ("O'Sullivan"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in light of the aforementioned remarks and respectfully requests reconsideration.

MPEP §2143 provides:

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teaching. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in the claims as currently amended. For example, independent claim 1 recites, (and

claims 26 and 56 in varying language) among other things, "an adapter port associated with a subset of said one or more memory module slots, said adapter port including associated memory resources; and at least one direct execution logic element coupled to said adapter port, said memory resources being selectively accessible by said at least one dense logic device and said at least one direct execution logic element."

The Examiner admits that Foster fails to teach an adaptor port associated with one or more memory module slots including associated memory resources selectively accessible by the dense logic device and coupled to at least one direct execution logic element. See USPTO communication dated December 14, 2005, page 6. To alleviate the deficiency of Foster, the Examiner turns to O'Sullivan. O'Sullivan however fails to teach or suggest such a limitation. Item 70 of Figure 4 in O'Sullivan and the paragraphs bridging pages 5-6 appear to teach nothing more than a standard microprocessor complete with serial ports, random access and read only access memory having operating software. Lines 7-41 of Column 7 of O'Sullivan appears to teach a hybrid communications control unit (of which the microprocessor 70 is a component) that connects the disclosed system to a public switched telephone network. The text cited by the Examiner explains that this hybrid card may be installed in the computer by a variety of means including being installed in a memory expansion or other expansion slot. See O'Sullivan Col 7, lines 30-34.

O'Sullivan fails to teach or suggest the elements recognized as lacking in Foster. O'Sullivan does not teach or suggest an adaptor port coupled to at least one direct execution logic element. Furthermore, O'Sullivan does not teach or suggest a memory resource that is selectively accessible by the dense logic device and the direct execution logic element. The Examiner's proposal that one skilled in the art would be motivated to make a modification in order to add an adapter belies his argument for obviousness. Neither Foster nor O'Sullivan teach or suggest an

adaptor port having memory resources that is further associated with one or more memory module slots nor do they teach or suggest a direct execution logic element coupled to the adapter port wherein the memory resources are selectively accessible by a dense logic device and the direct execution logic element. MPEP 2143 cannot be extended to create a claimed element that is absent from any of the cited references. The Examiner does not suggest modifying an element of Foster or O'Sullivan but rather suggests creating and adding the very limitation claimed by the Applicant's invention to supplant those found in Foster and O'Sullivan.

Finally and perhaps most significantly, the Applicant claims an adapter port associated with memory module slots. O'Sullivan discloses a hybrid communications control unit that may be installed into a computer via an expansion slot. See O'Sullivan Col. 30-34. An expansion slot and a memory module slot are distinct. One skilled in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention would recognize that O'Sullivan teaches connecting a circuit card to a computer via a peripheral component interconnect (PCI) bus. There is no suggestion that O'Sullivan's hybrid communications control unit would be connected to a computer's memory module. The rejection must fail.

As all of the claim limitations are not found in the cited references, the *prime facie* case for obviousness has not been reached. The Applicant requests the rejections of claims 1, 26, and 56 be withdrawn and the claims reconsidered.

Claims 2-25, 27-55, and 57-85 depend on claims 1, 26, and 56 respectively and are, for at least the same reasons mentioned above, patentable over Foster in view of O'Sullivan in further view of the references cited by the Examiner. As the underlying independent claims are patentable over Foster in view of O'Sullivan, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims dependent on claims 1, 26, and 56 as presented by the Examiner are deemed moot.

With respect to the rejections of claims 21, 51, and 70 the Examiner recites that Foster teaches the direct execution element comprises a control block coupled to the adapter port and refers the Applicant to item 70 of Figure 4. Figure 4 of Foster does not contain an item 70. Furthermore, item 70 of O'Sullivan which is a component of the hybrid communications control unit and, therefore, not coupled to the adapter port. The Applicant requests clarification.

In view of all of the above, the claims are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

March 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Michael C. Martensen, No. 46,901
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5910 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax